

REMARKS**Status of the Claims**

Claims 1-3, 6-13, 16-23, and 26-30 are currently present in the Application, and claims 1, 11, and 21 are independent claims. Claims 1, 9, 11, 21, 22, and 26-30 have been amended, and claims 4, 5, 14, 15, 24, and 25 have been canceled.

Drawings

Applicants note that the Office Action does not indicate whether Applicants' formal drawings, filed with the Application on January 12, 2004, are accepted by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner indicate whether Applicants' drawings are acceptable in the next action.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 21-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. As suggested by the Examiner, Applicants have amended independent claim 21 to clarify that Applicants claim a computer program product stored on a computer readable medium. The computer readable medium contains instructions for execution by a computer, which, when executed by the computer, cause the computer to implement the claimed method. Claims 22 and 26-30 have been amended to be consistent with claim 21.

Support for the amendments is found, for example, in Applicants' specification on page 28, line 15 through page 29, line 2. No new matter has been added as a result of the amendments. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 have been overcome, and respectfully request that the Examiner remove the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 9, 19, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Claims 9 and 29 have been amended

to provide proper antecedent basis for the third computer system. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 19, as filed, does not contain an antecedent basis issue. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 have been overcome and respectfully request that the Examiner remove the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claim Rejections - Alleged Anticipation Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-24, and 26-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Giles et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,986,047 (hereinafter Giles). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to include limitations previously found in dependent claims 4 and 5, and have therefore canceled claims 4 and 5. Similarly, Applicants have amended independent claims 11 and 21 to include limitations previously found in dependent claims 14 and 15, and 24 and 25, respectively, and have therefore canceled claims 14, 15, 24, and 25.

Based on these amendments, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are now moot, and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Claim Rejections – Alleged Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5, 15, and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giles in view of Schneier, "Applied Cryptography: Protocols, Algorithms, and Source Code in C" (hereinafter Schneier). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

As noted above, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to include limitations previously found in dependent claims 4 and 5, and have therefore canceled claims 4 and 5. Similarly, Applicants have amended independent claims 11 and 21 to include limitations previously found in dependent claims 14 and 15, and 24 and 25, respectively, and have therefore canceled claims 14, 15, 24, and 25.

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 11, and 21 to clarify that Applicants claim “identifying access control data pertaining to the second computer system,” and that the identified access control data includes “a domain, a maximum age, a path, a port, an authentication strength value, an authenticating server identifier, and an access control privilege identifier.” As noted in the Office Action on page 5, Giles discloses a client cookie that includes an encrypted portion, the encrypted portion including a global time out value and a cookie inactivity time out value (Giles, col. 8, line 52 through col. 9, line 8). However, Applicants respectfully submit that Giles does not teach or suggest “access control data” that includes “a domain, a maximum age, a path, a port, an authentication strength value, an authenticating server identifier, and an access control privilege identifier,” as taught and claimed by Applicants in independent claims 1, 11, and 21.

Applicants have further amended independent claims 1, 11, and 21 to clarify that Applicants create “an encrypted value based upon the access control data” by “hashing the access control data using a hashing algorithm, the hashing resulting in a hash value,” and then “encrypting the hash value.” Note that this is a two-step process. First, the access control data is hashed using a hashing algorithm, which results in a hash value. Second, the hash value is encrypted. Although, as noted by the Office Action, Giles discloses encrypting the first part of a cookie using a key, Kc, Giles does not teach or suggest the two-step process as taught and claimed by Applicants. The Office Action further cites Schneier as disclosing these elements of Applicants’ claims (see Office Action, pages 7-8). While Schneier discloses hashing in general, Schneier does not teach or suggest “creating an encrypted value based upon the access control data” by using the two-step process specifically taught and claimed by Applicants.

Based on the above discussion, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Giles nor Schneier nor a combination of the two, teach or suggest all the elements of Applicants’ independent claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 11, and 21, and the claims which depend from them, are patentable, and respectfully request that they be allowed.

Conclusion

As a result of the foregoing, it is asserted by Applicants that the remaining claims in the Application are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request an early allowance of such claims.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the Applicants' attorney listed below if the Examiner believes that such a discussion would be helpful in resolving any remaining questions or issues related to this Application.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Leslie A. Van Leeuwen, Reg. No. 42,196/

Leslie A. Van Leeuwen, Reg. No. 42,196

Van Leeuwen & Van Leeuwen

Attorneys for Applicant

Telephone: (512) 301-6738

Facsimile: (512) 301-6742